UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/844,544	04/27/2001	Defu Zeng	STAN 190	3043

24353 7590 02/12/2003

BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP
200 MIDDLEFIELD RD
SUITE 200
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

EXAMINER
DIBRINO, MARIANNE NMN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1644	9

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/844,544	ZENG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marianne DiBrino	1644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 November 2002 and 30 July 2002* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *3,11 and 14* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-10,12 and 13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
16)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
17)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *2 and 3* .
18)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
19)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
20)☐ Other:

fwd. 4/27/01 & 8/20/01, respectively

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicants responses filed 11/18/02 (Paper No. 8) and 7/30/02 (Paper No. 5) are acknowledged and have been entered.

2. Applicant's election with traverse of Group III (claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12 and 13), and species of antibody against multiple CD1 isotypes in Papers No. 5 and 8 is acknowledged.

   The basis for the traversal is Applicant's opinion that all the class of CD1 blocking agents represents a generic claim, i.e., the restriction groups I-VI are all different agents that block the binding of CD1 and TCR, so there is commonality of operation for all of the agents, that election of antibodies should be an election of species and that a reasonable number of species may be claimed in one application.

   Applicant's arguments have been considered, but are not persuasive.

   There are two criteria for a proper requirement for restriction between patentably distinct inventions:

   (1) The inventions must be independent (see MPEP 802.01, 806.04, 808.01) **or** distinct as claimed (see MPEP 806.05 - 806.05(I)); and
   (2) There must be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is not required (see MPEP 803.02, 806.04(a) - (j), 808.01(a) and 808.02).

The blocking agents used in the methods of restriction groups I-VI are distinct because they are capable of separate use and they are different biochemical molecules which differ in structure and composition. In addition, the claimed methods are distinct because they require different ingredients, process steps and endpoints.

Regarding undue burden, the M.P.E.P. 803 (July 1998) states that: For purposes of the initial requirement, a serious burden on the examiner may be prima facie shown if the examiner shows by appropriate explanation either separate classification, separate status in the art, or a different field of search. The restriction requirement enunciated in the previous Office Action meets this criterion of serious burden and therefore establishes that serious burden is placed on the Examiner by the examination of additional groups (item #2 of the previous Action).

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 10, 12 and 13 read on the elected species antibody to multiple CD1 isotypes.

Upon consideration of a search of the prior art, the search has been extended to include the species of antibody that binds specifically to human CD1d recited in instant claim 8.

Accordingly, claims 3, 11 and 14 (non-elected groups I, II and IV-VI) are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to non-elected inventions.

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 9, 10, 12 and 13 are currently being examined.

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

   The Brief Description of the Drawings does not list figures found in the drawings, i.e., the brief description should be of Figure 1 A-L, Figure 2 A, B and C, Figure 3A and B, Figure 4 A, B and C, Figure 5 A, B and C.

   Appropriate corrections are required.

4. It is noted that this application appears to claim subject matter disclosed in prior copending Application No. 60/200,285, filed 4/28/00. A reference to the prior application must be inserted as the first sentence of the specification of this application if applicant intends to rely on the filing date of the prior application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or 120. See 37 CFR 1.78(a). Also, the current status of all nonprovisional parent applications referenced should be included.

   Applicant should amend the first line of the specification to update the status (and relationship) of the priority documents.

   The first sentence of the specification should refer to the provisional application using language such as:

   This application claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/____, filed ____. See MPEP 1302.04

   If a statutory reference is included in this statement, if must be to 35 USC 119(e) and not to 35 USC 120.

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

   The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his Invention.

6. Applicant is reminded of the Revised Interim Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1 "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 64, No. 244, pages 71427-71440, Tuesday December 21, 1999; the following rejection is set forth herein.

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification does not provide adequate written description of the claimed invention. The legal standard for sufficiency of a patent's (or a specification's) written description is whether that description "reasonably conveys to the artisan that the inventor had possession at that time of the. . .claimed subject matter", Vas-Cath, Inc. V. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In the instant case, the specification does not convey to the artisan that the Applicant had possession at the time of invention of the claimed method of treating pathogenic polyclonal B cell activation or class switching in a patient, including in SLE, comprising administering a CD1 blocking agent, including wherein the said agent is a polypeptide or an antibody/fragment thereof, or a monoclonal antibody that binds to multiple human CD1 isotypes, and further comprising administering a second therapeutic agent for treatment of SLE.

The instant claims encompass treatment of patients with a CD1 blocking agent of undisclosed structure and/or specificity and a second agent of undisclosed structure. There is insufficient disclosure in the specification on treatment with said agents.

To fulfill the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe an invention and does so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can clearly conclude that "the inventor invented the claimed invention." Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc., 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (1997); In re Gosteli , 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (" [T]he description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [the inventor] invented what is claimed."). Thus, an applicant complies with the written description requirement "by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious," and by using "such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention." Lockwood , 107 F.3d at 1572, 41 USPQ2d at 1966.

An adequate written description of an agent "requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties," not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention. v. Revel, 984 F.2d 1164, 1171, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Accordingly, "an adequate written description ... requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it; Id. at 1170, 25 USPQ2d at 1606. The specification does not disclose the structure of said "agent(s)".

The specification discloses that CD1 blocking agents are molecules that interfere with the binding of CD1 by the TCR, for example by competitive or non-competitive binding to the extracellular domain of CD1, or to TCR that recognize CD1, and that the said agents do

not activate CD1 signaling (paragraph spanning pages 8 and 9). The specification further discloses that CD1 blocking agents may be peptides, lipids, either alone or in combination with a peptide, soluble CD1, small organic molecules, peptidometics, soluble TCRs, antibodies or the like or fragments of antibodies (paragraphs 0034-0035 on page 9). The specification discloses other agents that can be used with CD1 blocking agents to relieve symptoms of SLE, i.e., NSAIDS, corticosteroids, Umuran, Cytoxan, methotrexate, cyclosporin, anticoagulants (paragraph 0059 on page 16). The specification also discloses that "treatment" or "treating" is meant in the instant application to include "prophylaxis" (especially paragraphs 0060-0061 on page 17). The specification discloses treatment of NZB/NZW mice with the anti-CD1 mAb produced by hybridoma 1B1 (anti-mouse CD1d) (page 21-end) and in vitro activation of B cells by cross-linking CD1 using anti-CD1 mAb 3C11 (anti-rat CD1d) (page 20 at paragraph 0071). The specification does not disclose using any blocking agent in vivo that is not the anti-CD1 mAb produced by hybridoma 1B1. The specification does not disclose use of this antibody with a second agent. The specification does not disclose working examples of therapy as prophylaxis. The specification does not disclose a mAb that binds to multiple human CD1 isotypes, nor use of those antibodies in the claimed method of treatment.

In claims involving chemical materials, generic formulae usually indicate with specificity what the generic claims encompass. One skilled in the art can distinguish such a formula from others and can identify many of the species that the claims encompass. Accordingly, such a formula is normally an adequate description of the claimed genus. However, a generic statement such as "CD1 blocking agent" or "second therapeutic agent for the treatment of systemic lupus erythematosis" without more, is not an adequate written description of the genus because it does not distinguish the claimed genus from others, except by the property of being able to function as a CD1 blocking agent or as a therapeutic agent for treatment of SLE. It does not specifically define any of the agents that fall within its definition. It does not define any structural features commonly possessed by members of the genus that distinguish them from others. One skilled in the art therefore cannot, as one can do with a fully described genus, visualize or recognize the identity of the members of the genus. A definition by the property of function as a CD1 blocking agent or as a therapeutic agent for treatment of SLE does not suffice to define the genus because it is only an indication of what the property the agent has. See , 984 F.2d at 1169-71, 25 USPQ2d at 1605-06. It is only a definition of a useful result rather than a definition of what achieves that result. Many such species may achieve that result. The description requirement of the patent statute requires a description of an invention, not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one made that invention. See In re Wilder, 736 F.2d 1516, 1521, 222 USPQ 369, 372-73 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (affirming rejection because the specification does "little more than outlin [e] goals appellants hope the claimed invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate."). Accordingly, naming a type of material generally known to exist, in the absence of knowledge as to what that material consists of, is not a description of that material.

The instant disclosure of use of one anti-CD1 mAb as a blocking agent does not adequately describe the scope of the claimed invention, which encompasses a substantial variety of subgenera. Since the disclosure fails to provide sufficient relevant identifying

characteristics that identify members of the genus, and given the broad genus claimed, the disclosure is insufficient to describe the claimed genus.

7. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for treating pathogenic polyclonal B cell activation or class switching in a patient, including when the said class switching results in SLE, comprising administering a CD1 blocking agent that is an antibody to CD1 or cocktail of antibodies that bind to multiple human CD1 isotypes which interfere(s) with T cell recognition of CD1 and is inhibitory of CD1 signaling, does not reasonably provide enablement for the treatment (or prophylaxis) of pathogenic polyclonal B cell activation or class switching in a patient using a CD1 blocking agent that is not the said antibody/ies, nor which is a monoclonal antibody that binds to multiple human CD1 isotypes. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The specification does not disclose how to make and/or use the instant invention for the treatment (or prophylaxis) of the said activation/switching. The specification has not enabled the breadth of the claimed invention in view of the teachings of the specification because the claims encompass methods of treatment of polyclonal B cell activation or class switching using CD1 blocking agents of undisclosed structure. The state of the art is such that it is unpredictable in the absence of appropriate evidence whether the claimed agents can be made and/or used for treatment of polyclonal B cell activation or class switching in a patient, including when the class switching results in SLE, and including further administering a second therapeutic agent for treatment of SLE.

The specification discloses that CD1 blocking agents are molecules that interfere with the binding of CD1 by the TCR, for example by competitive or non-competitive binding to the extracellular domain of CD1, or to TCR that recognize CD1, and that the said agents do not activate CD1 signaling (paragraph spanning pages 8 and 9). The specification further discloses that CD1 blocking agents may be peptides, lipids, either alone or in combination with a peptide, soluble CD1, small organic molecules, peptidometics, soluble TCRs, antibodies or the like or fragments of antibodies (paragraphs 0034-0035 on page 9). The specification discloses other agents that can be used with CD1 blocking agents to relieve symptoms of SLE, i.e., NSAIDS, corticosteroids, Umuran, Cytoxan, methotrexate, cyclosporin, anticoagulants (paragraph 0059 on page 16). *The specification also discloses that "treatment" or "treating" is meant in the instant application to include "prophylaxis" (especially paragraphs 0060-0061 on page 17).* The specification discloses treatment of NZB/NZW mice with the anti-CD1 mAb produced by hybridoma 1B1 (anti-mouse CD1d) (page 21-end) and in vitro activation of B cells by cross-linking CD1 using the anti-CD1 mAb 3C11 (anti-rat CD1d) (page 20 at paragraph 0071).

The specification does not disclose using any blocking agent in vivo that is not with the anti-CD1 mAb produced by hybridoma 1B1. The specification does not disclose use of this antibody with a second agent. The specification does not disclose working examples of therapy as prophylaxis. The specification does not disclose any examples of a monoclonal

antibody that binds to multiple human CD1 istoypes, or use of the said antibody in the claimed method of treatment.

Evidentiary reference The Merck Manual teaches treatment of SLE using corticosteroids.

In view of the lack of predictability of the art to which the invention, undue experimentation would be required to practice the claimed methods. The enablement provided by the specification is not commensurate with the scope of the claims.

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103 and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amano et al (J. Immunol. 1998, 161: 1710-1717, IDS reference) in view of Kotzin (Cell, 1996, 85: 303-306, IDS reference), Zeng et al (J. Exp. Med. 1998, 187: 525-536), Blumberg et al (Immunol. Rev. 1995, 147: 5-29) and Hughes (Drug Disc. Today 3(10): 439-442, 1998).

Amano et al teach that the interaction between anti-CD1 T cells and B cells expressing surface CD1 leads to a mutual activation of both cell types that results in hypergammaglobulinemia and systemic autoimmunity in vivo via cross-linking of CD1 to secrete IgM and IgG. Amano et al further teach that transgenic CD1+ T cells (Vb9/Va4.4 T cell clone) induce lupus (SLE, an autoimmune disease) when transferred into nude host mice which do not spontaneously develop lupus and that spontaneous secretion of IgM and IgG by splenic B cells from lupus-prone NZB/NZW mice is mediated by CD1 hi subset of B cells (especially second to last paragraph of article). Amano et al teach that T cell proliferation of the said CD1-restricted T cell clone in response to CD1-transfected B cells could be blocked by use of the anti-CD1d mAb 3C11.

Amano et al do not teach the claimed method of treating pathogenic polyclonal B cell activation or class switching, including that resulting in lupus (SLE), in a patient, comprising administering a CD1 blocking agent that is an antibody, including a monoclonal antibody.

Kotzin teaches pathogenic IgG autoantibody production in SLE by clonal expansion of somatically mutated anti-DNA antibody-producing B cells (i.e., pathogenic polyclonal B cell activation), a process that mimics a normal T cell dependent response to foreign antigen, involving common mechanisms of affinity maturation, and IgM to IgG class switching (especially first paragraph on page 304). Kotzin teaches that IgG autoantibodies to ds-DNA appear to play a prominent role in the immune complex glomerulonephritis of SLE (especially last paragraph on page 303).

Zeng et al teach T cells with transgenic TCR that recognized CD1 of syngeneic B cells induced lupus with anti-ds DNA autoantibodies, proteinuria and immune complex glomerulonephritis in nude mice that don't spontaneously develop lupus (especially abstract). Zeng et al teach anti-CD1 mAbs, including 3C11 (anti-CD1d) (especially materials and methods). Zeng et al teach that severity of disease is associated with the development of the anti-ds DNA autoantibodies and with elevated serum IgG2a as has been observed with hereditary lupus (especially page 534 at the second full paragraph in column 1).

Blumberg et al teach that CD1c is expressed on human B cells in peripheral blood, spleen and tonsil, that CD1a, b and c are expressed on activated monocytes (GM-CSF+/- IL-4), CD1a is expressed on Langerhans cells, CD1a, b and c are expressed on dendritic cells in the dermis and CD1d is expressed in the GI tract on epithelial cells in mice and in humans as well as in other tissues at low levels (especially pages 14 and 15). Blumberg et al teach antibodies to the CD1 molecules, including 3C11 (anti-CD1d) and antibodies to CD1a, b and c. Blumberg et al further teach that 3C11 blocks the interaction of T cells with CD1d (especially second paragraph on page 23).

Hughes teaches administration of monoclonal blocking antibodies (such as anti-TNFa), including humanized or human antibodies, to patients for a variety of conditions including autoimmune disease.

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the anti-CD1d mAb taught by Zeng et al or Amano et al or the anti-CD1a, b, c and d antibodies taught by Blumberg et al to block CD1 recognition by Tcells as taught by Amano et al by administration of antibodies or humanized versions of the said antibodies to subjects with SLE as taught by Hughes for patients with autoimmune diseases.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to do this to treat SLE because Amano et al teach that interaction of anti-CD1 T cells and CD1-expressing B cells leads to systemic autoimmunity seen in SLE via secretion of IgG and IgM antibodies, that transgenic T cells specific for CD1 can induce SLE and that T cell proliferation of the said T cells can be blocked by the use of an anti-CD1 mAb, Kotzin et al teach pathogenic polyclonal B cell activation and switching in SLE by anti-DNA antibody-producing B cells, Zeng et al teach that anti-CD1 TCR bearing T cells

induce SLE and that the severity of disease is associated with the development of anti-DNA autoantibodies and elevated serum IgG2a (in mice), Zeng et al, Amano et al and Blumberg et al teach anti-CD1 mAbs, Blumberg et al further teach tissue distribution of CD1 isotypes on APC including B cells, and Hughes teaches administration of monoclonal blocking antibodies, including humanized antibodies to patients for a variety of conditions including autoimmune disease. Claim 12 is included in this rejection because the iv route of administration was well known in the art at the time the invention was made. Claim 8 is included in the instant rejection because the CD1d antibodies taught by Zeng et al or Amano et al would be expected to bind to human CD1d since CD1d of mice or rat would be expected to cross-react with human CD1d due to the high degree of homology between mouse, rat and human CD1d and as taught by Blumberg et al. Alternately, the value of monoclonal antibodies to proteins was well known in the art at the time the invention was made, in terms of specificity, purity and yield and Blumberg et al teach the human CD1d protein. A routineer would have used the same basic technique for producing monoclonal antagonist antibodies against human CD1d protein by using an appropriate in vitro assay where antagonistic antibodies could be detected.

10. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amano et al (J. Immunol. 1998, 161: 1710-1717, IDS reference) in view of Kotzin (Cell, 1996, 85: 303-306, IDS reference), Zeng et al (J. Exp. Med. 1998, 187: 525-536), Blumberg et al (Immunol. Rev. 1995, 147: 5-29) and Hughes (Drug Disc. Today 3(10): 439-442, 1998) as applied to claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10 and 12 above, and further in view of the Merck Manual (pages 1317-1321, 16th Edition, 1992).

The combination of Amano et al , Kotzin, Zeng et al, Blumberg et al and Hughes has been discussed supra, "the combined references".

The said combination does not teach the claimed method of treatment of activation/class switching that results in SLE, further comprising administration of a second therapeutic agent for the treatment of SLE.

The Merck Manual teaches treatment of SLE with corticosteroid treatment, such as with prednisone, in combination with immunosuppressive agents.

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have treated with the method of the combined references, i.e., administration of an immunosuppressive agent, an antibody to CD1 that blocks binding of the TCR, and further comprising treatment with the corticosteroid taught by the Merck Manual for treatment of SLE.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to do this in order to treat SLE as taught by the combined references and by the Merck Manual. The motivation to combine can arise from the expectation that the prior art elements will perform their expected functions to achieve their expected results when combined for their common known purpose. Section MPEP 2144.07.

11. The reference "AB" crossed out in the Form 1449 filed 8/20/01 has not been considered because it can't be located. It will be considered in the next Office Action. It would expedite prosecution if Applicant would send in copies of references.

12. No claim is allowed.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marianne DiBrino whose telephone number is 703-308-0061. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday and Thursday from 11 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan, can be reached on (703) 308-3973. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.
Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Marianne DiBrino, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Group 1640
Technology Center 1600
February 10, 2003

CHRISTINA CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600